

BEFORE THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(Under the Right to Information Act, 2005)
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA

Appeal No. 7020 of 2026

Shamshad Ahmed : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated June 20, 2026 (received by SEBI on June 24, 2026) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 22, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated August 03, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/R/P/26/00051; received by Office of Appellate Authority on August 05, 2026). I have perused the application, the response of the respondent and the appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
2. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application, sought the following information:
 - (i). *Details and documentation of action taken by M.I.R.S.D. department on my appointment request latter dated 11-02-2026.*
 - (ii). *Circular No.: HO/38/13/11(2)2026-MIRSD-POD/1/3750/2026 special window allowing investors to transfer and dematerialize (demart) Physical securities that were original purchase or sold before April 1, 2019.*
 - (iii). *Please confirm me date and time of appointment with committee which formed by MINISTRY OF CORPATE AFFAIRS for physical shares transfer special cases.”*
3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to query no. 1, in the application, informed that appellant’s complaint regarding transfer of shares in the reference dated 11.02.2026, was uploaded on SCORES website through OIAE and thereafter dealt under SCORES Complaint Registration No. SEBI/MH26/MUMB/008349/1. The respondent also informed that SCORES FAQ No. 22 available on

SCORES website, *inter-alia* states that the complainant can check the complete Action History of the complaint after logging to SCORES.

The respondent informed that no information was sought vide query no. 2.

With regard to query no. 3, the respondent informed that the information sought is in the nature of seeking appointment. Accordingly, the same cannot be construed as “information”, as defined u/s 2(f) of the RTI Act.

4. **Ground of appeal** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. With regard to query no.1, the respondent has informed that the appellant’s complaint dated 11.02.2026 was uploaded on SCORES. The respondent has also informed that the complete action history of the complaint can be accessed by the appellant by logging into SCORES. Accordingly, I find that the respondent has adequately addressed the query.
6. Further, I concur with the response of the respondent that no information was sought by the appellant vide query no.2.
7. With regard to query no.3, I note that the query is in the nature of seeking action from the respondent. In this context, I note that Hon’ble Central Information Commission in matter of *Mohan Kumar Sharma vs. CPIO, Prime Minister’s Office* (order dated November 26, 2019), held that “*under the RTI Act the CPIO provides information available with him or held by him. Thus, the appellant cannot expect the respondent to take certain action or initiate action as desired by him.*” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
8. In view of the above observations, I find that there is no need to interfere with the decision of the respondent. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai

Date: September 02, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

**APPELLATE AUTHORITY UNDER THE RTI ACT
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA**